



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Glossar. Man kann über die Anlage eines solchen verschieden denken: die Stichworte können in der Schreibung des Druckes oder auch in normalisierter Form gegeben werden. Brandes folgt im allgemeinen der ersten Auffassung. Die Inkonssequenzen, die dabei zahlreich begegnen, zeigen deutlich die Berechtigung der zweiten Ansicht, namentlich für einen Text wie den vorliegenden, der, von Anfängern kaum gelesen, in seinem Glossar weniger eine Brücke für diese als vielmehr eine Zusammenstellung des Wortschatzes und Wortgebrauchs bieten sollte. Einige Beispiele werden dies erhärten: Für stimmloses *s* (nd. *s*, mhd. *s*, *tz*) braucht der Setzer die Zeichen *s*, *fs*, *tz*. Dementsprechend trennt B. *boselen* (-ose-) von *botzelspyl* (-otze-); *sucker* steht unter *s*, *tzege* unter *t*; *Rutze*, Russe, ist hinter *Ruter* aufgeführt, *spytz*, spitz, unter -it-, aber *spyss*, Spitze, unter -is-. Die Übersichtlichkeit leidet hierunter, da zahlreiche Fälle ähnlicher Art begegnen, von denen ich hier nur wenige Beispiele anführen kann, wie *ummylde:unmyldicheyt* (-mm- S. 539: -nm- S. 540), *ambegyn:anbeghynnen* (unter -mb- und -nb-); *seyl*, *meyst*, *meysterschop* (-ei-): *mene*, *menen*, *mester* (-en-, bzw. -es-); *prediker* folgt hinter *predেকে*, *seggelen* hinter *segen*. Leichter sind die Fälle, in denen die zufällige Schreibung die Einordnung nicht beeinflusst, wie z. B. *anvangen:anfanck*; *oghe:ogenblick*; *afftheen*, *antheen:aftoch*; *buthe:buten*; *affghaen*, *afflaten:afganck*, *aflaet*; *lychte:lichtlyck*; *berichten:berycht*. Ähnlich im Namensverzeichnis am Schluss: *Ryge*, Riga, hinter *Rutzen*; *Yrlant* steht nach *W*; *Lyps*, Leipzig, nach *Lupke*, Lübeck; *Nydhard* nach *Norwegen*.

Es liesse sich wohl auch an einen oder den andern Artikel eine Bemerkung knüpfen, z.B. zu S. 478 *gheystlicheyt* 26, 17 (das für hd. *getzlicheyt* steht; Ro.: *vele fr'ude vnde lust de j'get hat*), *entfrommen* S. 475; *ghensen* (*ghans* S. 477) durfte unter *goes* (S. 483) mitbehandelt werden (Mnd. Grm. § 261). Nicht gerechtfertigt ist die Zusammenziehung von Adverb und Verb in ein Kompositum in Fällen wie *entjeghenlegen*, mit Lügen entgegen wirken, u.ä. unter *e*! Vgl. sogar *tovele* unter *t*. Ro. schreibt alle diese getrennt, wie Lüb. sich verhält, lässt der Abdruck nicht erkennen. Ebenso

unberechtigt ist die Trennung des Part. Prt. vom Verb, wo die verbale Bedeutung in der adjektivischen Funktion nicht verändert ist (*kopen* S. 496, *schryven* S. 521 unter *k*, *s*: *ghekoft* S. 479, *gheschreven* S. 481 unter *g*). Auch wäre im Interesse der Übersichtlichkeit zu wünschen, dass hd. Wörter als solche gekennzeichnet wären. Im Bestreben, Stelle für Stelle genau zu übersetzen und doch rein lautliche Umsetzung möglichst zu vermeiden, scheint in einigen Artikeln die spezielle Anpassung mit Hintansetzung der Grundbedeutung etwas weitgehend, z.B. *mederaken*, nicht unerwähnt lassen; *eynem eyn oor ansetten* (i. e. an die Narrenkappe), einem seine Torheit vorhalten, hintergehen, usw.

Aber dies sind kleine Einzelheiten, Wünsche, die der sorgfältigen Arbeit im ganzen kaum Abbruch tun. Ein Namensverzeichnis bildet den Schluss des Buches. Die niederdeutsche Sprachforschung ist dem Herausgeber dankbar für diese Gabe, die für die Literatur- wie die Buchdruckergeschichte Norddeutschlands wertvoll ist.

AGATHE LASCH.

Bryn Mawr College.

Le Roman de Renard, par LUCIEN FOULET. Paris, Champion, 1914. 574 pp. (*Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études, fascicule 211.*)

II

We can readily agree with Foulet that branches I (the so-called "plaid de Renard"), III (Renard's theft of the fish—Ysengrin's tonsure and the loss of his tail), IV (the story of how Renard tries to drown Ysengrin in a well), V (the division of the 'bacon' and the tale of the cricket), X ("Renard médecin") and XIV (Renard's fight with Tibert and with Primaut, the wolf's brother), all appeared shortly after the publication of the central branch, the existence of which they either admit or assume. For example, I, which opens

the cycle in ten out of fifteen mss., and which is undoubtedly one of the gems of the collection, begins by saying:

Perrot, qui son engin et s'art
Mist en vers fere de Renard,
Lessa le meus de sa matere.

It then proceeds to relate the judgment, or to use the technical term, the *plaid de Renard*. It will be recalled, a similar scene was enacted in Va, which Foulet regards as the continuation of II. Only there the wheels of justice had failed to move because Noble, with his characteristic weakness for Renard, had himself impugned the reliability of Hersent—an interested party—and it seemed doubtful that Ysengrin had witnessed her disgrace. What sensible man, implied BricheMER, wouldn't? Moreover, the trick so cleverly planned in II, to catch Renard by making him swear (*escondire*) on the body of Roonel, the hound, who feigns death, had failed, and the court of justice had resolved itself into a mad but futile chase after the fox. Thus, according to Foulet, branch I comes à propos. Perrot would be the author of II, and the *meus de la matere* which he neglected, would be the new judgment or *plaid* related in branch I. Here Renard is accused by all the animals in unison—a situation from which his ingenuity again saves him, for he pretends to have a contrite heart and is planning, he says, a pilgrimage *outré mer*. Doubtless the tale is told well; the symbolism of mediaeval life is maintained better than elsewhere; the author has a high sense of his art; Ste. Beuve who knew branch I asked himself: “si le hasard seul a pu produire une parodie si fine, qu'elle ressemble à l'art même.”²⁰ Yet Foulet is, I believe, right in his opposition to Sudre, that Va is the earlier tale and I a secondary version. The identification, so admirably worked out in I, of the animal epic with the real world of *seigneurs* and their unruly retainers, is prepared by branches II and Va, and in I reaches its fru-

ition, both in idea and style—and hence I is subsequent to II and Va. Unlike the fables of La Fontaine, the *Renard* still lacks a critic like Taine to interpret its social significance, but Foulet comes close to rendering that service. The excellent pages in which he characterizes branch I are not only the best in his book, but among the best ever written on mediaeval French literature.

So, too, we may agree that III, IV and XIV are among the earliest branches, while V and XV (the “compagnonnage”—I should call it—of Renart and Tibert), whatever their date, were written with direct reference to II, with which in fact they could be incorporated. Thus V not only imitates *Ysengrimus*, but in some places translates it (on this point Martin, Voretzsch, Sudre, and Foulet agree); at the same time the opening lines²¹ fit in with the closing episode of II; and XV refers in so many words to episode 3 (the so-called “steeple-chase”) of branch II. As for III, Foulet concludes that though independent of II in matter, it yet owes its substance to *Ysengrimus*, and is influenced by II: thus the wolf is called *monseigneur*, the fox lives in *chastel Renard*, and the two animals are officially known as *compères*, while certain verses distinctly recall well-known verses of II. On the other hand, IV is an epic fable from the *Disciplina Clericalis*. The story does not occur in *Ysengrimus*, Marie²² or any *Romulus*. Phaedrus in the fable *Vulpes et Caper* employs the same *motif* but lacks the characteristic traits of our version (the incident of the two pails). These occur first in a commentary on the Talmud by the rabbi Rashi, who was born at Troyes in 1040. From his work the story might naturally pass to the *Disciplina*, since Petrus Alphonsus had access to Hebrew sources; and from the *Disciplina*—whose popularity is attested by the *Lai de l'oiselet*, an adaptation—the story became known to the author of IV,

²¹ Vv. 8–9.

²² Marie de France has only the story of *De vulpe et umbra lunae*; cf. *Fables*, ed. Warnke.

²⁰ *Lundis*, VIII, 287; cf. Foulet, pp. 332 ff.

assuming as we have every reason to assume that he was at least half as well read as the author of II.²³

A similar case of clerical provenience is furnished by X, only here the ultimate source is Æsop's fable of the Sick Lion. In the eighth century Paulus Diaconus gave an epic version of this story, replacing the wolf by the bear, as the victim of the fox's cunning. The *Ecclasis Captivi* of the tenth century then enlarged the framework of the tale by transporting the scene into a humanized animal-world: the lion now suffers from a kidney-trouble; the wolf reappears, this time as *camerarius* to his tawny majesty; and when the fox, whom the court has previously sentenced, appears, he brings "ointments," but he also demands the skin of his *patrinus*, the wolf. In this version the wolf's life is temporarily spared since his executioners, the lynx and the bear, do not skin his head and feet—although he does die in the end. This tale as we have it in the somewhat legalized form of the *Ysengrimus*, Foulet considers the source of our version. Yet, again, the author of X knew the preceding branches, for the prologue of X obviously seeks to rival that of I, and the two branches are thus akin. The same is true also of the very late branches, XXIII and XXVII, which in turn indicate the popularity of I, an influence which Foulet discovers as well in the Franco-Italian poem *Rainardo*.

But what of the *Reinhart Fuchs*, written in 1180? All the critics, with the sole exception of Paulin Paris, have derived the German poem from a lost French *Renard*, itself the prototype of our stories. And how explain the other seven branches (VII, VIII, IX, XI, XII, XVI and XVII) of the original group of sixteen? Did they, too, have Latin sources? Or are they, like I, literary originals, dependent—if dependent at all—on the group we have been consid-

ering? Here it seems would lie the crux of Foulet's contention that not only is the *Renard* literary in its principal source and inspiration, but that it is literary throughout, a work of genial monks in which the folk, as such, had little or no share. Whatever may be our verdict on the latter question, we must at least grant that the evidence from the German poem of Glichezâre is strongly in Foulet's favor.

In the first place, the branches we have considered comprise all of the subjects found in the *Reinhart Fuchs*. It is universally admitted that Glichezâre's poem is the only poem on the *Renard* which has a consistent plot; those least favorable to Glichezâre's originality admit that 342 verses or at least $\frac{1}{7}$ of his work is of his own invention, and that he was an author of marked distinction, capable, if need be, of considerable independence. In the second place, Voretzsch, who gave final form (in *Zeitschrift* XV, 124 and following numbers) to the current theory, views the *Renard* as practically a continuous work like the *Ivain* or the *Troie*. This it is manifestly not. So that, neglecting the disparity, chronological and other, of the various branches, which he thus views on about the same level, he wrongly concludes that the illogical and heterogeneous *Renard* could not have inspired the consecutive and homogeneous *Reinhart Fuchs*. And granting even that his premise were correct, it does not follow that a logical composition cannot have been taken from an illogical one. Besides, as Foulet demonstrates, Glichezâre is not as consistent as Voretzsch maintains.

An example of Voretzsch's method is furnished by the story of Tiécelin and the cheese²⁴ (see above). In the *Renard*, the fox, who was wounded in his preceding encounter with the cat, complains to the crow that the odor of the cheese is harmful to his wound. Glichezâre, who does not relate the adventure with Tibert, nevertheless retains this feature. Yet according to Sudre, whose argument Voretzsch repeats, it was not Glichezâre who here reversed the sequence of his original, but rather the *re-*

²³ Voretzsch argued from a sudden drop in the percentage of *rimes riches* that IV is by two different authors. This Foulet contests by adducing branch XVII which shows a similar variation but which is obviously by one hand.

²⁴ Foulet, pp. 420 ff.

manieur of the lost French version. He remembered that the fox was once wounded in an encounter with Tibert, consequently he made this tale the introduction to the one in which Renard—according to Sudre—beguiled Tiécelin about an imaginary wound (“une blessure imaginaire”).

In short, the evidence of the German poem would not in itself justify us in assuming a lost French version. And such a step becomes quite unnecessary when we consider Glichezâre's object. Obviously this was to write a connected story of Renard and Ysengrin; further, that story was to be short and condensed. Glichezâre's eye was therefore fixed on the various episodes of his original rather than on its division into branches. So considered, the tales fall into three groups: (a) the conflict between Renard and an animal weaker than himself; (b) his conflict with Ysengrin in open warfare; (c) his conflict with him while professing to be his friend. In Glichezâre, group (b) naturally had to follow group (c)—but the French branches gave at least three accounts of Renard's forced appearance at Noble's court. Glichezâre could not use all of these, so he hit upon the following sequence: the *escondit*, now explained by a suspicion of Ysengrin's that his wife is not all that she should be; the sudden flight of Renard; the rape of Hersent; the judgment at Noble's court and Renard's vengeance as physician to the king. A similar attempt at unification, says Foulet, was made in 1350 by the Flemish poet who took branch VI as his framework, yet one has only to compare in order to see that Glichezâre succeeded where the former failed. Thus it was Glichezâre who first put our discursive collection of branches—at least that section of it current before 1180—into a consistent form.

In treating the other problem of the omitted branches, Foulet, it seems to me, is less successful, and the weakness of his too great insistence on literary provenience makes itself felt. Thus branch VIII which relates the pilgrimage at *loca sancta* of Renard, certainly a clerical idea, is motivated by the widespread theme of the league of the weak—“la ligue des

faibles,” as Sudre calls it.²⁵ The weaker animals, each of whom is threatened by some imminent danger, meet—more or less casually—and band together in their common misfortune. In several versions of this tale, the fox does not figure at all or, if so, he plays a subordinate rôle. Thus in a Russian variant a cat is the protagonist, in a Norwegian it is a sheep, in a Westphalian it is a dog (cf. the *Bremerstadtmusikanten*, where we have an ass), in certain others a man joins the animals, etc. Yet in all these cases the animals escape the first danger in order to fall into a second and greater one. So that assuming—for the moment—that some such narrative underlay our story, the animals in league with the fox would naturally be attacked by wolves. In some cases the attack on them occurs as they are gathered about a fire in the woods; in others it takes place in a house where they have sought shelter—this, strange to say, is the case in our version. Now the story is already told in the Latin *Ysengrimus* with the additional *motif* of the pilgrimage. We entirely agree with Foulet that branch VIII took the story from the Latin poem, since it is more natural to ascribe its variation from the Latin to the more popular, epic tone of the French *trouvère* than to seek it in a hypothetical common source. But whether we side with Foulet or with Sudre in this respect, in either case the ultimate derivation seems to us folkloristic, and the clerk or *trouvère* would simply have adapted the folktale to his social setting by linking it to the contemporary motive of a pilgrimage. While Foulet would object—as indeed he practically does in his last chapter—that it is unjustifiable to take a modern folktale, no matter how extensive its diffusion, as a proof of what occurred in the twelfth century, the fact that such a twelfth-century folktale is not recorded does not disprove its existence, and the modern versions, in this case quite independent of the *Renard*, argue that it may have existed—and that possibility once admitted, Foulet's extreme position seems to us untenable.

Or let us take another of the “omitted”

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 212 ff.

branches, no. IX. Here we have the story of the rich *vilain* or serf who, while plowing his field, grows so disgusted with one of his oxen that he invokes the bear against him. No sooner said than the bear claims his victim. The fox now acts as intermediary between the serf and the bear, much to the former's ultimate harm. The author of IX asserts that he has the tale from a story-teller,

Qui tos les conteors surmonte
Qui soient de ci jusqu'en Puille.

And Krohn²⁶ and Sudre²⁷ have no difficulty in unearthing the story in popular modern versions. Foulet²⁸ grants that "il est possible qu'il faille en effet voir dans un récit de ce genre la source de l'auteur de IX." Yet in the end he concludes for a less similar version contained in the *Disciplina clericalis*. Why? Because the Latin text, "littéraire celle-là, . . . a l'avantage très sensible à nos yeux d'être chronologiquement antérieure au Roman de Renard."

In other words, although the "omitted" branches doubtless were all written with reference to those already in existence, and XVII, containing the *processio*, probably formed—to use Foulet's expression—*la conclusion joyeuse* of the entire original group,²⁹ still clerical sources need not necessarily have been exclusively used. We can admit, as we certainly must, that the *Roman de Renard* is a literary work of the twelfth century, in the main the product of clerics employing written Latin material, without asserting that the *Ysengrimus* of 1152 was wholly literary in its origin, or that the accessible sources after that date were entirely such. The sobriquets 'Ysengrin' and 'Renard' are obviously not classical. To reject the theory of Grimm that the tales in which these names occur came into being contemporaneously with them, *i. e.*, at a time when 'Ysengrin' and 'Renard' were ety-

mologically significant, does not compel us to disagree with G. Paris that "tous ces noms sont incontestablement germaniques." "Comment admettre," continues Paris (p. 25), "qu'un poète (ou un simple conteur) soit allé chercher pour le donner à son loup un nom qui aurait été inconnu dans son pays?" No-gent, writing in 1112, could have easily meant "some people in general (*aliqui*)" and not only clerks. In another place³⁰ he carefully distinguishes hearsay from authenticated tradition (*scriptorum veracium traditio*), and he apparently knew the talk of the people. One of Foulet's strongest points (p. 566) is his observation that the clergy were the intermediaries between the other social groups in the Middle Ages. Hence they were responsible, he argues, for the diffusion of the *Renard* among the people. But doubtless also the clergy and the folk interacted. This he appears to forget, for if the clergy enriched the folk-mind, the clerics may well have drawn on the store-house of popular lore. "Il est bien digne de remarque," to quote again Paris,³¹ "que des fables de Phèdre . . . qui, par l'intermédiaire des mises en prose, ont été connues au moyen âge, il en est peu qui aient trouvé accès dans le *Roman de Renard*." It is one thing to reduce the evidence of folklore to its proper sphere, especially when that evidence is modern and collected in a very unscientific manner by word of mouth. On this every sensible person must agree with Foulet. But it is another matter to deny it any value, not as an absolute proof of what did exist, but as an indication of what might have existed. Mediaeval France had its professional "conteurs," and their stock in trade was hardly derived wholly from antecedent literary works. On the contrary, if popular tales for which we cannot find a literary source are still current to-day, to how much greater an extent this must have been the case in the twelfth century. And to this fact the animal tale could not have been an exception. For these reasons,

²⁶ Mann und Fuchs, *Drei vergleichende Märchenstudien*, Helsingfors, 1891, pp. 11-37.

²⁷ Ch. IV.

²⁸ P. 446.

²⁹ Ch. XVIII.

³⁰ See, *e. g.*, *Patrologia latina*, CLVI, § 330, p. 613.

³¹ P. 51.

I believe, the last chapters of Foulet's treatise are the least valuable part of his contribution.

One further point, and we may conclude. Early ³² in his work Foulet sets up the theory that the author of branch II was a certain Pierre de St. Cloud. The writer of branch XVI calls himself by this name, and branch XXV refers to the *aventures et conte* which Pieres de Saint Clout related, *ans et jors a ja passés*. We recall ³³ that the prologue of I had said that *Perrot . . . lessa le meus de sa matere*. Since Foulet interprets this as a reference to branch II, Perrot, whom he identifies with Pierre de St. Cloud, would be the author of II and thus the person most concerned in the composition of the romance.

On the surface the theory is inviting. It is, however, beset with various difficulties. The chief authority for the name is a branch which is a mediocre work of art: a later and unsuccessful part of the cycle. Sudre,³⁴ who was deeply impressed with the fact, concluded that Pierre de St. Cloud is a pseudonym chosen by the *remanieur* of XVI, and dismissed the theory that the name has any bearing on the authorship of the cycle. G. Paris was of practically the same opinion.³⁵ Voretzsch, to quote his most recent statement,³⁶ says: "Pierre von St. Cloud wird an verschiedenen stellen als verfasser von Renart branchen genannt, ohne dass man ihm eine der vorhandenen mit bestimmtheit zuschreiben könnte." And, indeed, Foulet himself remarks: "il est peu probable que le trouvère qui vers 1177 eut l'idée très neuve de composer un poème héroï-comique de Renart et d'Isengrin, se soit avisé, plus de vingt ans après, d'y ajouter un assez médiocre supplément." But if Pierre de St. Cloud is not the author of XVI, how can we argue that he was the author of II? Pierre ³⁷ is a common Christian name; branch XXV is posterior to branch

XVI and may well have derived its reference from it; the author of II, so explicit about his literary equipment, is silent about himself. Moreover, the name does occur elsewhere. The *Roman d'Alexandre*, in part IV, the earliest dating of which is 1180, mentions a *Pieres de St. Clout*, but in an entirely different and rather obscure connection; and in 1209 Caesar-ius of Heisterbach speaks of a *Petrus de Sancto Clodovaldo* who became a monk to escape persecution. Neither of these references is to a person of the character of our trouvère, and the attempt ³⁸ to connect them with each other has, as Foulet admits, failed. Consequently, the only safe conclusion, it seems to us, is to grant that the author of branch II is still unknown.

Except for the limitations mentioned, however, the new treatise on the *Renard* is bound to stand. The admission of some popular influence does not militate against the important fact that the poets of the twelfth century drew chiefly on mediaeval monastic sources. On this essential point Foulet requires no vindication. We can subscribe to the statement that their point of departure was the "*Romulus* en prose,"³⁹ peut-être l'*Ecbasis*, certainement et surtout l'*Ysengrimus*." As for their originality: "lisons," says Foulet, "les poèmes de Renard."⁴⁰ Nous y trouverons des inventions

³² Jonckbloët, *Etude sur le roman de Renart*, 1863, pp. 290 ff.

³³ Pp. 548 ff.

³⁴ Foulet makes no independent attempt to establish the locality in which the *Renard* originated. See p. 14. G. Paris thinks Pierre de St. Cloud was a Parisian (*Ext.* p. 10), "à moins qu'il ne s'agisse de Saint-Cloud-sur-Touque (Calvados)." He places II and Va in Normandy; I (on account of *uelomme*, v. 777) in Artois, so too X and XIV; XI and XV in Picardy, likewise VIII; while VII refers to Compiègne and would thus belong to the Ile-de-France. On the whole, the north-east would thus be the district in which the story was composed. Cf. *Ysengrimus* written by Nivard of Ghent, and also the reference of Guibert de Nogent concerning Laon.

It is to be regretted that the volume has no index. From misprints it is singularly free. We noted only one of importance: p. 372, l. 7, "l'ours, son *patrinus*" should read "le loup, son *patrinus*."

³² Pp. 22 ff.

³³ See above.

³⁴ P. 22.

³⁵ P. 14.

³⁶ *Einführung*², p. 404.

³⁷ See, however, G. Paris, p. 10, who says: "Ce Perrot . . . est certainement le Pierre de Saint-Cloud que la branche XVI se donne pour auteur."

antiques, des mœurs médiévales, un souffle de large humanité. Et notre étonnement sera que, pendant si longtemps, on ait pu faire passer pour un ramassis incohérent de textes remaniés et rapetassés une des productions les plus achevées et les plus originales de l'ancienne France."

WM. A. NITZE.

University of Chicago.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE INTERIOR OF THE FORTUNE

In view of the comparatively small amount of direct information regarding the Elizabethan theatre, it is surprising that the following vivid description of the interior of the Fortune has hitherto escaped notice.

The Fortune, it will be remembered, was not round, but square. The passage, which has previously been regarded as fanciful, is obviously a description of theatre and audience as if they constituted the fourth wall of the apartment in which the scene is laid. In Act I, scene i of *The Roaring Girl*, "As it hath lately beene Acted on the Fortune-stage," Sir Alexander Wengrave ushers his friends into a room in his house:

Sir Alex. . . . Th' inner room was too close:
how do you like

This parlour, gentlemen?

All. O, passing well!

Sir Adam. What a sweet breath the air casts here,
so cool!

Goshawk. I like the prospect best.

Laeton. See how 'tis furnish'd!

Sir Davy. A very fair sweet room.

Sir Alex. Sir Davy Dapper,

The furniture that doth adorn this room

Cost many a fair grey groat ere it came here;

But good things are most cheap when they're most dear.

Nay, when you look into my galleries,

How bravely they're trimm'd up, you all shall swear

You're highly pleas'd to see what's set down there:
Stories of men and women, mix'd together,

Fair ones with foul, like sunshine in wet weather;

Within one square a thousand heads are laid,
So close that all of heads the room seems made;
As many faces there, fill'd with blithe looks,
Shew like the promising titles of new books
Writ merrily, the readers being their own eyes,
Which seem to move and to give plaudities;
And here and there, whilst with obsequious ears
Throng'd heaps do listen, a cut-purse thrusts and
leers

With hawk's eyes for his prey; I need not shew
him;

By a hanging, villainous look yourselves may know
him,

The face is drawn so rarely: then, sir, below,
The very floor, as 'twere, waves to and fro,
And, like a floating island, seems to move
Upon a sea bound in with shores above.

All. These sights are excellent!

Mr. Bullen (Middleton, Vol I, Introd. p. xxxvi) attributes the lines to Dekker. The attribution is doubtless correct; not, however, on the ground that the passage is only an "airy extravagance."

MARTIN W. SAMPSON.

Cornell University.

Noires Saies

In his edition of *Berte aus grans piés* (Bruxelles, 1874), Scheler remarks in his note to line 221 (*Berte chaï pasmee sor un drap noir com saie*): "Je ne sais pas comment justifier l'expression *noir com saie*; le mot aurait-il peut-être pris l'acception spéciale de drap mortuaire?"

In a note on the word "saie," in the *ZRPh.*, XXV, 354 f., Meyer-Lübke comments on the same passage: "Das Wesentliche, Eigenartige der *saie* ist im Mittelalter die schwarze Farbe gewesen, und zwar in solchem Grade, dass Adenet geradezu den Vergleich wagen konnte *un drap noir com saie* (*Berte* 37), ein Vergleich der Scheler (Anm. zu der Stelle) und gewiss vielen andern nicht ganz verständlich war, da man daraus allein doch nicht wohl schliessen durfte, dass die *saie* überhaupt 'schwarz' gewesen sei, der aber sofort das Befremdliche verliert, wenn man damit Barb. u. M. I 345, 2298 zusammenhält, wo ein Geistlicher sagt *Mais por*